

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-14, 27, and 28 are pending in the present application. Claims 2, 15-26 and 29-39 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter contained therein. The Applicant reserves the right to file a divisional application directed to the subject matter of cancelled claims 15-26 and 29-39.

**A. Rejection of Claims 27 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 27 and 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Griffith et al. (US Published Application 2002-0039050). This rejection is respectfully traversed in view of the above amendments to the claims.

In formulating the rejection of independent claim 27, the Examiner alleges that the method recitation is inherent in the disclosed structure of Griffith et al. This position by the Examiner is respectfully traversed.

To establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. Inherency cannot be established by probabilities, possibilities, or mere assertion. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is insufficient to establish a basis for asserting inherency.

As set forth above, independent claim 27 recites a method of calibrating a phase-locked loop bandwidth by setting a phase-locked loop at a local oscillator offset; allowing the phase-locked loop to settle; measuring, after allowing the phase-locked loop set to the local oscillator offset to settle, a first voltage of a voltage-controlled oscillator located in the phase-locked loop; setting the phase-locked loop to a channel center frequency; allowing the phase-locked loop to settle; measuring, after allowing the phase-locked loop set to the channel center frequency to settle, a second voltage of the voltage-controlled oscillator; determining a difference between the first and second voltage measurements; and controlling a programmable charge circuit located in the phase-locked loop to adjust its output current level based on the determined voltage difference.

It is clear from the record that the Examiner's argument directed to establishing the alleged inherency of the claimed method is based upon a probability or possibility that the disclosed structure could or would perform the claimed method recitation.

More specifically, the Examiner has failed to establish a factual basis demonstrating that one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to perform the claimed method recitation. Moreover, the Examiner has failed to demonstrate that the art of record would teach or suggest the performing of the claimed method recitation.

The only basis that the Examiner offers to support the notion that one of ordinary skill in the art would be taught, led, or motivated to perform the claimed method recitation is the Examiner's own unsupported assertion. This is pure conjecture on the part of the Examiner, as the prior art or record fails to, explicitly or implicitly, teach or suggest such a proposition. More specifically, the prior art of record fails to support an assertion that the disclosed structure would perform the claimed method recitation, as the Examiner appears to assert as fact.

Notwithstanding the Examiner's failure to demonstrate that the art of record would teach or suggest the performing of the claimed method recitation, Griffith et al. fails to anticipate the presently claimed invention as set forth by amended independent claim 27. More specifically, amended independent claim 27 recites that the method measures, after allowing the phase-locked loop set to the local oscillator offset to settle, a first voltage of a voltage-controlled oscillator located in the phase-locked loop and measures, after allowing the phase-locked loop set to the channel center frequency to settle, a second voltage of the voltage-controlled oscillator.

In other words, amended independent claim 27 recites the measuring of two different voltages at two different times (the first time after the phase-locked loop set to the local oscillator offset is allowed to settle and the second time after the phase-locked loop set to the channel center frequency is allowed to settle). The Examiner, in the Office Action dated April 3, 2006, clearly sets forth that Griffith et al. fails to teach the measuring of two different voltages at two different times.

Therefore, Griffith et al., explicitly and inherently, fails to anticipate the presently claimed invention as set forth by independent claim 27.

Accordingly, in view of the above submitted amendments and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

**Entry of Amendments under 37 C.F.R. 1.116**

The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter these amendments under 37 C.F.R. 1.116 for the following reasons. As demonstrated above, the present amendments place the application in condition for allowance. The above amendments do not raise any new issues which the Examiner has not previously considered. More specifically, the Examiner in a previous Office Action identified the allowable subject matter added to claim 27. Moreover, the amendments clearly reduce the issues present in this application and place the application in better condition for appeal. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully request entry under 37 C.F.R. 1.116.

**Conclusion**

Accordingly, in view of the amendments and the reasons set forth above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the present rejection. Also, an early indication of allowability is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Matthew E. Connors  
Registration No. 33,298  
Gauthier & Connors LLP  
225 Franklin Street, Suite 2300  
Boston, Massachusetts 02110  
Telephone: (617) 426-9180  
Extension 112

MEC/MJN/mjn